

Jeremy
Martinich/DC/USEPA/US
07/20/2010 02:29 PM

To: Marcus Sarofim
cc: Rona Birnbaum
bcc:
Subject: Fw: Harry Read Me PDF for docketing

Marcus, does this look good to you? Let me know.

Thanks,
Jeremy

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871

----- Forwarded by Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US on 07/20/2010 02:29 PM -----

From: "Tracy Parham" <Tracy.Parham@erg.com>
To: Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
Date: 07/20/2010 11:30 AM
Subject: Harry Read Me PDF for docketing

Jeremy,

Here is the Harry Read Me PDF for you to review. We added a cover page for it - please let us know if this is what you wanted.

Thanks,
Tracy

>>> Mae Thomas 7/19/2010 11:10 AM >>>
See the red bold text below. Can you do this?

>>> <Martinich.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov> 7/15/2010 2:29 PM >>>
Hi Mae,

See below.

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
-----|
|"Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
|

>-----
-----|
|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
-----|
|Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
|

>-----
-----|
|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
-----|
|Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com> |

>-----
-----|
|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
-----|
|07/15/2010 01:23 PM
|

>-----
-----|
|----->
| Subject: |

|----->

>-----

-----|

|Re: Specific Editing Directions for Volumes

|

>-----

-----|

Ok Jeremy

It seems like we should add the HarryReadMe PDF file to the reference list. Do you want us to do that? Seems like this came up before and at that time you did not want us to put it in the reference list. Let me know how you want to go on this.

- Yes, please add the HarryReadMe PDF file to the reference list. Also, please add it to the list of files to be docketed.

Just to double check, I assume that we will use track changes to show our changes and we will keep any track changes or balloons that were in the documents when we get the volumes?

- Yes on both fronts. Please use track changes and preserve any existing track changes and balloons.

Thanks

Mae

>>> <Martinich.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov> 7/15/2010 1:10 PM >>>

Hi Mae,

A couple of more directions:

- We should be using the present tense when describing petitioners' arguments.

- Assuming that this can be done, please make the 'HarryReadMe' file into a PDF. Please include a cover page stating what it is. This will need to be docketed as well, but please send me a copy of it when it is completed so that I can review it.

Finally, another correction to my email from last night. Please disregard the following item and do not do anything to the volumes in this regard:

- EPA should be the agent taking the action in this case, not the Administrator. Even though the Administrator made the Finding, the Agency is now taking the action. For example, we should not be stating in the Volumes that the "Administrator finds that..." but rather "EPA finds that..." Please flag (with comment bubbles) any changes you make in this vein.

Thanks!
Jeremy

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|"Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|07/15/2010 11:54 AM
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Re: Specific Editing Directions for Volumes
|

>-----
-----|

Yes, please do all 5. Sorry about that.

And yes, please use this report for the first one:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/387/387i.pdf>

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|"Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|"Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|07/15/2010 11:39 AM

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Re: Specific Editing Directions for Volumes

>-----
-----|

Jeremy, you listed five reports, but said in your paragraph that there were 4. I just want to verify that you want all 5.

The other question: the first report you listed, do you mean, this report:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/387/387i.pdf>

or did you mean the website here:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-archive/science-technology/s-t-cru-inquiry/>

?

Thanks
Mae

>>> <Martinich.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov> 7/15/2010 11:09 AM >>>
Hi Mae,

Here are the page counts:

Volume 1: 150 pages

Volume 2: 70 pages

Volume 3: 100 pages

We have one more task to add to the list I sent you yesterday. The following links are four investigative reports that have been released recently regarding the CRU e-mails. We would like them to be combined into one PDF file (you can order them by their release dates - oldest to most recent). Also, please create a new title page for the PDF (you can label it "Recent Inquiries and Investigations of the CRU Emails and IPCC Findings"). On this title page, please also include a table of contents listing each report's title and what page it can be found on in the PDF. FYI, this PDF file will need to be docketed when the denial is signed in two weeks. You can send me the file once it's done, and I will review it.

UK Parliament House of Commons inquiry into the unauthorized publication of data, emails and documents relating to the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU):

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-archive/science-technology/s-t-cru-inquiry/>

Penn State Mann investigation

http://live.psu.edu/fullimg/userpics/10026/Final_Investigation_Report.pdf

Assessing an IPCC assessment. An analysis of statements on projected regional impacts in the 2007 report (from Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency), http://www.pbl.nl/images/500216002_tcm61-48119.pdf

The Independent Climate Change Email Review (funded by University of East Anglia)

<http://www.cce-review.org/pdf/FINAL%20REPORT.pdf>

Report of the International Panel set up by the University of East Anglia to examine the research of the Climatic Research Unit.

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/CRUstatements/SAP>

Finally, I have one amendment to one of my bullets from last night.
Please add the subsections to the TOCs for the three volumes.
- Please develop table of contents for each of the three volumes. These
should itemize the main sections and the subsections of each volume.
Please create a placeholder to insert the page numbers for these, as you
did with the RTCs.

Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks!
Jeremy

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|"Mae Thomas" <Mae.Thomas@erg.com>
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA |

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|07/15/2010 08:05 AM
|

>-----
-----|

|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
-----|

|Re: Specific Editing Directions for Volumes
|

>-----

-----|

Hi Jeremy, one question to help me get the right number of staff ready.
Do these volumes now have the appendices incorporated, so that now they
are 200 pages or more each?

Thank you
Mae

>>> <Martinich.Jeremy@epamail.epa.gov> 07/14/10 6:09 PM >>>

Hi Mae,

Here are specific editing instructions for your review of the three
Volumes. Our current plan is to deliver the volumes to you and receive
them back according to the following schedule. I'll let you know if
this is going to slip (we are trying hard to make sure that it doesn't).

Volume 1 to ERG by COB on Monday (7/19)
Volume 2 to ERG by COB on Tuesday (7/20)
Volume 3 to ERG by COB on Wednesday (7/21)
Volume 1 back from ERG by COB on Wednesday (7/21)
Volume 2 back from ERG by COB on Thursday (7/22)
Volume 3 back from ERG by COB on Friday (7/23)

In addition to doing the normal editing, please keep the following in
mind while reviewing the three volumes we send you next week:

- Please insert a cover page for each volume. I've attached an example
for Volume 1.
(See attached file: Cover Sheet 7-13-10.doc)

- Please develop table of contents for each of the three volumes. These
should itemize the main sections of each volume, but don't need to get
into the various subsections. Please create a placeholder to insert the
page numbers for these, as you did with the RTCs.

- In referring to the FR notice, we should use the terminology - "the
Denial." It has been referred to as the 'Decision Document' or the 'FR
Notice' in a lot of places throughout the volumes. This should be

replaced.

- We refer to the collective set of three volumes as the "Support Document." Please replace "Support Document" with "Response to Petitions document." We can abbreviate this with "RTP document", but we should spell it out once at the top of each volume. You'll see that in many places throughout the volumes, we state 'please see Volume 1 of the

Support Document.' This should be changed to 'please see Volume 1 of the RTP document.'

- EPA should be the agent taking the action in this case, not the Administrator. Even though the Administrator made the Finding, the Agency is now taking the action. For example, we should not be stating in the Volumes that the "Administrator finds that..." but rather "EPA finds that..." Please flag (with comment bubbles) any changes you make in this vein.

- In referring to the Response to Comments document, we should spell it out once, and then use the abbreviated version (i.e., "RTC document")

- In referring to the Endangerment Finding, we should use capital letters. In referring to the Findings (e.g., Endanger and/or Cause or Contribute Findings), we should use capital letters. It is fine to say the following (note capitalization): Endangerment Finding, the Findings, or Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings. It is not ok to say the following (note capitalization): endangerment finding, the findings, or endangerment and cause or contribute findings.

- Make sure that court cases are underlined or italicized, whichever is preferred by the FR.

- Please use the same format in the titles of all sections and subsections. You can use the format that we used in the RTCs. BOLD the title of the section, BOLD and indent the titles of subsections.

- Please number each comment and response in the three volumes - the same way that we did it in the RTCs (e.g., Comment 1-1, Response 1-1, Comment 1-2...).

- Please add the reference list for each volume at the end of the volume.

- It should be "gray literature" not 'grey'

- Please search each volume for "preliminary conclusion" and

"preliminary response." These are old relics that will need to be removed. Please flag these for us.

- In referring to the CRU e-mails, we should be consistent throughout the volumes. Please use the following: "CRU emails". Please flag any changes you have doubts on.
- Also, lets standardize e-mails and use "e-mails" instead of 'emails'
- When we discuss text from the CRU emails for the first time in a comment/response, we should include a citation to where the email can be found in the PDF document of all CRU emails (e.g., page 763, line 13 of the PDF version entitled: CRU Emails 1996-2009.pdf). This has already been done in some volumes, but not in others.
- Any URLs that have been placed in the text or made as footnotes, should be changed into references and placed in the reference section.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Jeremy

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871



HARRY_READ_ME.pdf

Jason
Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
03/26/2010 02:04 PM

To Rona Birnbaum
cc Marcus Sarofim, Ben DeAngelo, Lesley Jantarasami, Jeremy Martinich
bcc
Subject latestresponse section 5 -- is science undermined

This incorporates Dr. Ben's comments, and some structural tweaks.

Here it is--

Jason



Preliminary Response Sec 5 - Is Science Undermined.doc

**Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US**

02/12/2010 05:30 PM

To Rona Birnbaum, Jeremy Martinich, Ben DeAngelo, Jason
Samenow, Marcus Sarofim, Michael Kolian, David Chalmers

cc

bcc

Subject list of issues in emails

Hello everyone,

I've compiled a list of all the issues that you identified thus far in the CRU emails. Please let me know if I am missing anything major from this list (especially Ben and Mike), or if you'd like to add any additional/clarifying details. If possible, please send your edits by Tues at 2pm, so that I can bring an updated list to our meeting at 3pm.



Email Issue Breakdown 021210.doc

Thanks!

Lesley

Lesley Jantarasami
US EPA, Climate Change Division
Climate Science & Impacts Branch
202.343.9929
202.343.2202 (fax)
Jantarasami.Lesley@epa.gov

Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US

To Isabel DeLuca

02/03/2010 05:05 PM

cc Rona Birnbaum, Jason Samenow, Marcus Sarofim

bcc

Subject Q&As on emails & Himalayas

Isabel,

Slightly edited what was already there for the emails and drafted a response for the Himalayas (drawing largely from previously developed talking pts).

-Ben



Q&A language BJD.doc

Benjamin J. DeAngelo
Climate Change Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6207J)
Washington, DC 20460

Tel: +1 202-343-9107
Fax: +1 202-343-2202
deangelo.ben@epa.gov

Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US

To Rona Birnbaum

02/05/2010 02:44 PM

cc

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Latest letter

This looks ok to me. In this sentence there was a missing "of":

More recently, EPA has received an administrative petition for reconsideration **of** the final findings based on the released emails.

And I suppose we have our pick regarding what quote to us from the PSU finding. There are three definitive findings of no misconduct found, whereas the 4th finding is that further inquiry is required to judge whether or not Mann in more general terms did things to cause public mistrust.

Rona Birnbaum

let me know if you see something here. ----- For...

02/05/2010 01:53:27 PM

From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
To: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/05/2010 01:53 PM
Subject: Fw: Latest letter

let me know if you see something here.

----- Forwarded by Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US on 02/05/2010 01:52 PM -----

From: David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dina Kruger <dinakruger1@gmail.com>
Cc: Carol Holmes/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gina McCarthy/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Joseph Goffman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Nancy Ketcham-Colwill/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/05/2010 12:52 PM
Subject: Re: Latest Issa Letter

Thanks Dina. Not sure if I'm included because I'm supposed to weigh in now, but I've attached suggested edits for what they're worth.



Issa-2_response_DRAFT_-2_5_10_v1[2] - redline.doc

Dina Kruger

Apologies for using gmail -- can't get into EPA m...

02/05/2010 12:14:53 PM

From: Dina Kruger <dinakruger1@gmail.com>
To: Joseph Goffman/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Carol Holmes/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Nancy Ketcham-Colwill/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gina McCarthy/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/05/2010 12:14 PM
Subject: Latest Issa Letter

Apologies for using gmail -- can't get into EPA mail remotely right now. But here's a redraft of the Issa letter following on my discussion with Joe yesterday. I'm sharing with everyone at one

time because of the time pressure, possibility that we might want to discuss this afternoon, and generally to keep it moving.

It is a little tricky to think about how to discuss given the petition we're responding to. I defer to lawyers on how best to handle.

Hope this is helpful. I'm going to be doing a few errands and back by 1:30. can be reached by cell if needed sooner

Dina

[attachment "Issa-2_response_DRAFT_-2_5_10_v1[2].doc" deleted by David McIntosh/DC/USEPA/US]

John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US

07/28/2010 01:17 PM

To John Hannon

cc Ben DeAngelo, Ben DeAngelo, Dina Kruger, Jason Samenow, Jeremy Martinich, Lesley Jantarasami, Marcus Sarofim, Rona Birnbaum

bcc

Subject Re: new FR version

Additional edits, through end of the document.



Draft FR Notice 07-28-10 MASTER -jh728 v3.doc

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

John Hannon

additional edits, through IV.C.1. John Hannon

07/28/2010 12:04:24 PM

From: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
To: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo <ben.deangelo@gmail.com>, Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 12:04 PM
Subject: Re: new FR version

additional edits, through IV.C.1.

[attachment "Draft FR Notice 07-28-10 MASTER -jh728 v2.doc" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

John Hannon

I am off to a 10:00 with my front office, here are...

07/28/2010 10:00:58 AM

From: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
To: Ben DeAngelo <ben.deangelo@gmail.com>
Cc: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 10:00 AM
Subject: Re: new FR version

I am off to a 10:00 with my front office, here are my edits through Section III. Little things here and there. Please let me know about the issue on pp 91-92 re "fingerprints."

[attachment "Draft FR Notice 07-28-10 MASTER -jh728 v1.doc" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

Ben DeAngelo

All comments that have been submitted to date (...)

07/28/2010 06:23:15 AM

From: Ben DeAngelo <ben.deangelo@gmail.com>
To: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 06:23 AM
Subject: new FR version

All comments that have been submitted to date (incl. Paul B's, all John's batches from last night, Dina's, Marcus and Lesley's from last night, and previous OGC/DOJ) are in this document.

But there are still a number of misc issues to tick off. I've deleted comment bubbles that had clearly been addressed and kept others where there's still an outstanding issue or where it's useful to flag how a comment was addressed.

I will be in the office by around 7:15 and will need to work with most of you to walk through some remaining issues.

-Ben[attachment "Draft FR Notice 07-28-10 MASTER.doc" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

**Marcus
Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US**

04/27/2010 05:10 PM

To Rona Birnbaum

cc

bcc

Subject Re: the info is needed NOW!!!!



TopTenForAdministrator.doc

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
fax: 202-343-2202
1310 L Street 256C
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
with the EPA Climate Division

Rona Birnbaum

04/27/2010 04:57:10 PM

From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/27/2010 04:57 PM
Subject: the info is needed NOW!!!!

Jason
Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
07/22/2010 07:00 PM

To Lesley Jantarasami
cc Marcus Sarofim, Rona Birnbaum
bcc
Subject Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

I took a crack at this. Parts of the answer are a little unconventional-- so feel free to make suggestions and/or tell me this is off base...



Warwick Hughes comment + JPS.doc

Lesley Jantarasami [Hi guys, Jason offered to take a first cut at crafti...](#) 07/22/2010 01:44:17 PM

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 01:44 PM
Subject: Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Hi guys,

Jason offered to take a first cut at crafting a response if I wrote the comment summary (see attached). Marcus, maybe you can comment on the draft later this afternoon?

[attachment "Warwick Hughes comment.doc" deleted by Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US]

Thanks so much for your help - Dina's comments on Vol 3 are extensive, and we're trying to finish our edits by tomorrow...

Lesley

Marcus Sarofim ["Lastly \(Marcus-- this is where you come in\) -- w...](#) 07/22/2010 01:08:13 PM

From: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US
To: Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 01:08 PM
Subject: Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

"Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- we might want to say that irrespective of Jones' reluctance to provide Hughes with the data, he does direct Hughes to various places for obtaining the data, while noting some of the data is restricted by governments. Also maybe we can say the HadCRUT trends were reproducible and that the methods for the temperature record had all been published?"

I agree with Jason that some more context in this response would be good: Jones does point Warwick Hughes at the available GHCN data in his e-mail response. You can also cite volume 1: perhaps something like, Responses in Volume 1.3.3.1 demonstrate that temperature reconstructions from publically available data such as GHCN look very similar to temperature reconstructions from HadCRUT.

that the methods used by HadCRUT have been well-described in the literature, and that "the recent Independent Climate Change E-mails Review managed to write computer code from scratch in a space of two days that produced results similar to the HadCRUT and other independent analyses, working with publically accessible data."

-Marcus

ps. It would be nice to see Warwick's original email: some people seem to claim that it was the raw data (as suggested by Jones' response mentioning IPR problems with national Met offices), but others seem to claim that it was the list of stations that CRU used (which would somewhat less defensible because IPR reasons would no longer hold, though it still would be a pain to deal with). But I can't find it anywhere.

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
fax: 202-343-2202
1310 L Street 256C
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
with the EPA Climate Division

Jason Samenow

Lesley-- There's a long comment and response...

07/22/2010 12:28:05 PM

From: Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 12:28 PM
Subject: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Lesley--

There's a long comment and response on page 74-75 of Vol 3 which includes the following quote from Phil Jones cited by Peabody:

"We have 25 years or so invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?"

Then we say:

"There is no evidence to support the claim that Mann and Jones were attempting to obstruct the scientific method or avoid an honest review of their work because they feared criticism."

I think the courts could interpret the Jones quote as evidence of Jones seeking to avoid an honest review of his work.

Furthermore, this quote is included in the context of discussions on paleoclimate data -- when it was actually referring the HadCRUT instrumental temperature record.

This is the evident from the full email (from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3502.htm> -- note I don't think this email is from the CRU emails- but rather from an email Hughes submitted as evidence in the House of Commons Inquiry):

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 12:12:22 +0000

From: Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>

To: "wshughes@iinet.net.au" <wshughes@iinet.net.au>

Subject: Re: WMO non respondo

Warwick,

Hans Teunisson will reply. He'll tell you which other people should

reply. Hans is "Hans Teunissen" <HTeunissen@wmo.int> .

I should warn you that some data we have we are not supposed to pass on to others. We can pass on the gridded data - which we do. Even if WMO agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it. There is IPR to consider.

You can get similar data from GHCN at NCDC. Australia isn't restricted there. Several European countries are. Basically because, for example, France doesn't want the French picking up data on France from Asheville. Meteo France wants to supply data to the French on France. Same story in most of the others.

Cheers

Phil

I think there needs to be a separate comment and response on this issue. The Muir Russell report uses the Jones quote on page 37 : <http://www.cce-review.org/pdf/FINAL%20REPORT.pdf> to support a recommendation for "a new approach to the integrity, accessibility, and stewardship of data in publicly-funded science, arguing that researchers should make all research data, methods, and other information underlying the results publicly accessible in a timely manner."

So I think we should not try to defend Jones too much here and state this his comments were regrettable while mentioning possible motivations for his defensiveness.

This excerpt from an online discussion on the issue from a couple journalists -- who were seemingly

objective on the matter (from:
<http://www.monbiot.com/archives/2010/04/08/debate-with-steve-easterbrook/>) might provide some insights/ideas:

(keep reading below this long excerpt, I have one additional closing thought)

George writes:

Hi Steve,

I haven't yet read the Mashey report, which I will do now. But don't the emails suggest that M&M might actually have been right to believe that the restrictive licences were, at least in part, a smokescreen?:

"If FOIA does ever get used by anyone, there is also IPR to consider as well. Data is covered by all the agreements we sign with people, so I will be hiding behind them."

[Here's what Jones told another requester:](#)

"Even if WMO agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it."

And shouldn't we be concerned that commercial considerations are getting in the way of the free flow of information? Is that not antithetical to the open society and the spirit of scientific inquiry? It's something I've campaigned against in other areas: particularly the patenting of genetic material.

I react against it for two reasons: first that it's an enclosure of a common (and in this case publicly-funded) resource, secondly that it's the kind of convenient excuse everyone in authority hides behind these days, when there's something they don't want to tell us. (Sorry, I can't tell you that – security you know, er, health and safety, er commercial confidentiality). Here in the UK the terms of the stealthy privatisation of almost the entire public sector (the Private Finance Initiative) were kept secret from the public on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. I campaigned against that excuse for years. Only by using the FOIA, and by harrassing the bastards mercilessly, did we finally open up that can of worms, by which time it was all too late. I hope this gives you more of an idea of why my gut response is different from yours.

Steve writes:

George,

Yes, the emails make it quite clear Jones doesn't want to hand over his data, and is prepared to use any excuse not to. At face value, it certainly looks like he's got something to hide. But what? His work on the temperature reconstructions is sound, as has been shown by other reconstructions. The allegations made by M&M about temperature biases in surface station selection were clearly shown to be wrong by several independent analyses, including work by

Tamino:

<http://tamino.wordpress.com/2010/02/25/false-claims-proven-false/>

by Wood and Steig:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2009/12/are-the-cru-data-suspect-an-objective-assessment/>

and many others. There's nothing wrong with any of the data, nor any of the science from Jones' team at the CRU. So why does Jones act in the emails like someone who wants to hide evidence?

The only reasonable explanation is that he wants to withhold the data because he's quite simply fed up with the constant baseless attacks. Ben Santer had already warned him how much time and effort it takes having to correct misrepresentations of their work. Refusing to cooperate with time-wasters is completely rational. We can argue whether in the long run this was a good idea; we can argue over what strategy scientists might best adopt in this situation. But the fact is that Jones chose the path of withholding his data, motivated partly by anger and partly by the desire to protect his time.

Bear in mind of course, that releasing datasets requires a non-trivial amount of work (to define the meta-data, and document the processing that has occurred), and often will still be useless to anyone else anyway. Bob Grumbine explains why:

<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2009/11/data-set-reproducibility.html>
<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2010/03/what-should-be-reproducible.html>

The normal practice is for other labs to get hold of the raw data independently and do their own reconstructions. So when someone comes along demanding the data, because they want to find flaws in work that's already been thoroughly replicated elsewhere, and is known to be sound, well, they're just timewasters.

And yes, there is a bigger context here – this science is fundamentally important for public policymaking, and must withstand a much higher degree of scrutiny than normal. Phil Jones might be guilty of not grasping this bigger issue, but then I don't think many people have put much thought into how we do this. The climate modelers I've spoken to cannot defend their software practices, nor can they adequately demonstrate they are using best practices (comparable, say with the best in the commercial software world). However, when you look at what they do, it turns out to be phenomenally good. The problem isn't that the code isn't subjected to scrutiny; the problem is that it's subjected to so much scrutiny in so many ways by so many people that nobody can give a coherent account of all of these, nor how they add up (I've made it my research goal to produce such an account for software development practices of climate scientists – I hope others can do the same for the data handling practices).

Bottom line: There are two hypotheses for why Jones talks this way in the emails: (1) because he has something nefarious to hide or (2) because he's fed up with people wasting time and making

unfounded allegations, and wants nothing to do with them. Hypothesis 1 depends on there being something wrong with his work, but the reconstructions show it's sound. So we have to go with hypothesis 2.

BTW I agree completely with your comments about commercial considerations getting in the way of the free flow of information in the science community. Unfortunately, this is a result of lack of funding, particularly of meteorological research. Many weather services around the globe (the Met Office included) gain part of their funding from selling commercial forecasting services, and there is tough competition for some of the bigger customers. The dataset that M&M are after is drawn from meteorological services in many different countries, and many of them place different restrictions on it to protect their interests (several countries, including Canada, have refused to release their portions). Most of this, Jones and the CRU have no control over; when they obtained the data from these many different sources they had to sign agreements to respect confidentiality. Part of Jones' frustration is the amount of effort it took to do this (hence his response that M&M go collect the data from these various sources themselves).

We'd all much prefer meteorological data to be free and open – it would make our lives much easier. But we're faced with constant pressure on universities and government research labs to prove their value by commercializing the outcomes of their research, and by selling services. A growing proportion of the research is no longer publically funded – it's funded by industrial research grants and by income earned on "intellectual property". We're going to have to untangle the mess that free market ideology has made of our public research institutions to fix this problem. The real irony is that the those on the rightwing who have been most active in pushing this commercialization of research labs are now the ones screaming most loudly about freeing the data.

George writes:

Thanks for this Steve. I think you make a good case for what Jones's motivation might have been (and I wish to God that he or the university had come forward at an early stage to explain it: the mishandling of this crisis is a whole other saga).

If true, it sounds like a tragedy straight out of a Hardy novel – Jude the Obscure or Tess of the Durbervilles perhaps – misplaced action, misunderstood intentions, letters under the doormat. I'm prepared to believe that Jones is a good man who, partly because of the constraints he was under, made a series of disastrous tactical errors. On this account he emerges as a tragic figure, in the classical sense.

But, as Hardy shows, ultimately it's the actions, not the intentions that count. This is what we end up being judged by, and why it is so important both to act strategically and to act as if the world is watching. These days it probably is. It remains possible to praise the intention and condemn the action. Though he might have been acting with good intentions I still believe that what Jones did was wrong – and offensive to democratic values.

The points you make about commercial agreements are good ones. I would love to see scientists use this crisis to campaign for proper public funding of climate science and an end to the

jumblesale of public assets.

Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- we might want to say that irrespective of Jones reluctance to provide Hughes with the data, he does direct Hughes to various places for obtaining the data, while noting some of the data is restricted by governments. Also maybe we can say the HadCRUT trends were reproducible and that the methods for the temperature record had all been published? (Marcus-- I believe Hughes request to Jones was for the original data for the HadCRUT dataset-- according to Pat Michaels (<http://article.nationalreview.com/407512/the-dog-ate-global-warming/patrick-j-michaels>): "Warwick Hughes, an Australian scientist, wondered where that “+/-” [in the temperature trend] came from, so he politely wrote Phil Jones in early 2005, asking for the original data."

Thanks for your patience on this :)

Jason

John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
07/29/2010 10:19 AM

To Lesley Jantarasami
cc Dina Kruger, Erin Birgfeld, Rona Birnbaum
bcc
Subject Re: Volume 3

OK, here are comments on 3.1 and 3.2.



Volume 3 Process Issues 7-28 at 7pm -jh729.DOC

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

Lesley Jantarasami [Here you go, John--](#)

07/29/2010 08:15:33 AM

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 08:15 AM
Subject: Re: Volume 3

Here you go, John--

[attachment "Volume 3 Process Issues 7-28 at 7pm.DOC" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

John Hannon [Can someone send me Volume 3? I'd like to go...](#)

07/29/2010 08:14:44 AM

From: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 08:14 AM
Subject: Re: Volume 3

Can someone send me Volume 3? I'd like to go over 3.1 and 3.2. Thanks.

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

Dina Kruger

[I understand that no one is thinking about this pi...](#)

07/29/2010 08:07:04 AM

From: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US
To: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 08:07 AM
Subject: Re: the top emails

I understand that no one is thinking about this piece in that way at this time, but I am thinking of how we can potentially use something like this as a communication piece, or leverage it in that direction. But I still haven't reviewed what Lesley sent, so stay tuned.

Dina Kruger
Director, Climate Change Division
USEPA

202-343-9039 (phone)
202-343-2290 (fax)

Rona Birnbaum

[Just to follow up on the top emails piece request...](#)

07/29/2010 07:08:28 AM

From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 07:08 AM
Subject: Re: the top emails

Just to follow up on the top emails piece requested by OPA, it is not something that anyone envisions releasing to the public. Rather, if people raise specific questions with regard to these specific emails, folks wanted to know that they could be referred to specific places in the RTP for the response.

Thanks, Rona

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

Dina Kruger

----- Original Message -----

From: Dina Kruger
Sent: 07/28/2010 11:23 PM EDT
To: Rona Birnbaum; John Hannon
Cc: Lesley Jantarasami
Subject: Re: the top emails

Thanks -

I'll take a look tomorrow and we should consider if this is something to frame as a comm piece. (Don't know if its suited to that now, but a way for the public to have the other side of the most notorious emails would be good.)

Have read 3.4 and hats off to John and Lesley. It is really strong. I'm now turning to the rest of the document. It will likely be a long night, but I think we're in a good place.

Dina

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services
Rona Birnbaum

----- Original Message -----

From: Rona Birnbaum
Sent: 07/28/2010 09:48 PM EDT
To: John Hannon
Cc: Dina Kruger; Lesley Jantarasami
Subject: the top emails

John, Erin and the press office asked for something very similar to what you had asked for.....the top emails that appeared in the press and whether/where we respond. Lesley has done that attached below.

----- Forwarded by Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US on 07/28/2010 09:45 PM -----

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stacy Kika/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 09:36 PM
Subject: Re: Prepping for Press Questions tomorrow

Erin, here is the Top 13 list - the sound bite quotes are in bold. Please let me know if you need more specific notations about where to find our answers to these in the volumes.

[attachment "Top 13 List.doc" deleted by Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US]

Lesley

Erin Birgfeld

Lesley - could you provide me on one document,...

07/28/2010 07:03:29 PM

From: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US
To: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stacy Kika/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 07:03 PM
Subject: Prepping for Press Questions tomorrow

Lesley - could you provide me on one document, the text of the "top 13" horrible emails that are used in the petitions and on blogs etc...

Marcus - could you provide me with the names of the studies that were included in the IPCC report despite the fact that scientists in emails said they were not acceptable for inclusion in IPCC. Also, a quick Q and A on the issue around the 2 studies that were not relevant to the report. Also, can you provide the sections that these issues are discussed in the decision docs.

Thank you both.

-Erin

Erin Birgfeld
Director of Communications
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
phone: (202) 343-9079
fax: (202) 343-2202

Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
02/23/2010 02:48 PM

To Ben DeAngelo, Jason Samenow, Jeremy Martinich, Michael
Kolian, Rona Birnbaum, Marcus Sarofim
cc
bcc
Subject update to petition overview table

Hi all,

I've updated the petitions table to include the newest Ohio Coal supplement. Just FYI - the columns do not differentiate which comments were made in the original petition vs which were made in the supplements.



Overview of Petitions Table 02-23-10.doc

Lesley

Jason
Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
07/26/2010 10:13 PM

To Rona Birnbaum
cc Marcus Sarofim, Ben DeAngelo, Jeremy Martinich, Lesley Jantarasami
bcc
Subject Re: for your immediate review: internal Qs and As (MS+RB)

Some comments attached.

-----Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
Date: 07/26/2010 08:35PM
cc: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: Re: for your immediate review: internal Qs and As (MS+RB)

Thanks for adding those Lesley. I agree with Marcus' comment and made a few additional comments attached here.

(See attached file: Q and A's - 7-26 LJ-mcs.doc)

Marcus Sarofim---07/26/2010 07:48:34 PM---I would add that the WMO graph was unrelated to the IPCC assessments (and perhaps that it was not us

Fro Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US
m:
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Dat 07/26/2010 07:48 PM
e:
Sub Re: for your immediate review: internal Qs and As
ject
:

I would add that the WMO graph was unrelated to the IPCC assessments

(and perhaps that it was not used in the Endangerment process?)

(see attached example)

And I wish we could say something about the quality of the studies that the scientists were complaining about (and that were published and included in the IPCC), but I recognize that isn't our role...

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
fax: 202-343-2202
1310 L Street 256C
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
with the EPA Climate Division

-----Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US
From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
Date: 07/26/2010 06:48PM
cc: Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: for your immediate review: internal Qs and As

Hi all,

I added a few more Qs and As on specific allegations from the CRU emails (taken from our Top "13" list). Let me know if you have comments or think we should add any more Qs to get a representative sample of the major issues. If you could get me comments back tonight that would be great, because we need to get to Dina ASAP.

(See attached file: Q and A's - 7-26 LJ.doc)

Muchas gracias,

Lesley

[attachment "Q and A's - 7-26 LJ.doc" removed by Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US][attachment "Q and A's - 7-26 LJ-mcs.doc" deleted by Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US]

[attachment "Q and A's - 7-26 LJ-mcs.doc" removed by Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US]

Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
07/27/2010 03:21 PM

To John Hannon
cc Rona Birnbaum, Marcus Sarofim
bcc
Subject Re: for your review - Section 3.4

Thanks for your edits on section 3.4, John. On your question about the relevance of the hockey stick, this is what Marcus has to say:

Mann (1999) is included in the AR4 paleoclimate chart (all 3 TAR reconstructions were included), and Mann (1998) and Mann (1999) were both discussed in the AR4 text along with the controversies involved. So I think we definitely cannot say they were not included in AR4 (and "not relied upon" seems too ambiguous for comfort). Also, some sources of data behind Mann (1998/99) are probably still included in the newer assessments, so I'd also avoid implying that concerns over all data behind the figure are worthless.

Marcus' new suggested language: In addition, the "hockey stick" papers are more than a decade old. Since their publication, numerous studies have been published that improved on the original methodology and that include newer and different sources of data. Given this body of newer work, petitioners' concerns over the construction of a decade old figure are of little if any scientific relevance.

This would replace the text you highlighted on page 14.

Lesley

John Hannon

Lesley, here are my edits/comments on 3.4. I m...

07/27/2010 12:46:54 PM

From: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Suzanne Kocchi/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/27/2010 12:46 PM
Subject: Re: for your review - Section 3.4

Lesley, here are my edits/comments on 3.4. I made some changes throughout, largely to shift the focus somewhat so there is less reliance on "you did not prove they actually deleted any e-mails" and more reliance on "none of this indicates that the science is flawed or wrong." Let me know what you think. I also had one question about the current relevance of the debate over the data underlying the "hockey stick figure." I thought that was an outdated analysis at this point, and basically irrelevant as AR4 did not rely on that but on more recent research and analyses.

I'll get back to you on the question about the SAB in 3.3. My inclination is not to add the insert, as it addresses somewhat different issue, but probably not to say anymore in 3.3. We rebut their claims on the merits, so that leaves nothing to ask SAB to review anyway. I don't think we need to highlight it. But, will think some more.

[attachment "Volume 3 Process Issues_3.4 only jh727.doc" deleted by Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US]

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563

Fax (202) 564-5603

Lesley Jantarasami

Hi John, Here is Section 3.4 from Vol 3. Sorry f...

07/26/2010 04:38:25 PM

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US, Suzanne Kocchi/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/26/2010 04:38 PM
Subject: for your review - Section3.4

Hi John,

Here is Section 3.4 from Vol 3. Sorry for the delay but we discovered an issue I wanted to correct before sending this to you. I'm also attaching an additional comment we expanded upon in Section 3.3. It has to do with Pacific Legal Foundation's request for SAB review. You and Carol drafted some language that we used in another section of Vol 3 regarding SAB review. I am wondering if we can copy / paste the same language into this section, or if something new needs to be drafted (see attached for the copy/paste). Ben is also wondering if we should include anything about the SAB in the Decision Document.

[attachment "Volume 3 Process Issues_3.4 only.doc" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

[attachment "3.3 comment re SAB.doc" deleted by John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US]

Thanks,

Lesley

Rona
Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
12/18/2009 01:11 PM

To Ben DeAngelo
cc Isabel DeLuca, "Dina Kruger"
bcc
Subject Re: Fw: Issa response

yes! perfect.

Ben DeAngelo [Actually think the statement can stay: Michael M...](#) 12/18/2009 12:44:05 PM

From: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US
To: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Dina Kruger" <Kruger.Dina@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 12/18/2009 12:44 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Issa response

Actually think the statement can stay:

Michael Mann from Penn State has a letter to the editor to today's Post where he says:

The conspiracy theories about the e-mails are fueled in part by their criticisms of the quality of two papers regarding global warming and a suggestion that at least one of the papers be kept out of an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report. As Nature noted in a recent [editorial](#), neither the e-mail writers nor the IPCC suppressed any findings. Both papers were included in the IPCC's report.

However, don't think the statement should say "several studies", and it can say that the IPCC report did more than consider the studies, it included them: "Indeed, the IPCC process has included the studies that some of the scientists involved in the CRU emails suggested were not worthy of consideration because of concerns about their scientific validity."

Rona Birnbaum [agree with you Ben that statement should come...](#) 12/18/2009 12:13:13 PM

From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
To: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, "Dina Kruger" <Kruger.Dina@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 12/18/2009 12:13 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Issa response

agree with you Ben that statement should come out. Otherwise, the letter looks good. I have a weekly with Dina at 2:00 and can check if she has anything more on this and if not, I'll let Nancy know. (I believe Isabel is out.)
Rona

Ben DeAngelo [Looked through. Made minor edits for the sente...](#) 12/18/2009 12:00:12 PM

From: Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US
To: Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Rona Birnbaum" <Birnbaum.Rona@epamail.epa.gov>, "Dina Kruger" <Kruger.Dina@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 12/18/2009 12:00 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: Issa response

Looked through. Made minor edits for the sentence including ocean acidification. There is one question in there (from Nancy?) I can't confirm in a short time:

Indeed, the IPCC process has included consideration of several studies that some of the scientists involved in the CRU emails suggested were not worthy of consideration because of concerns about their scientific validity [am I right about this?].

Weren't the emails talking about prospective papers in the next IPCC assessment? So not sure this sentence is true, and if we can't quickly confirm not sure it's necessary for this letter.

-Ben

[attachment "Issa.12-2.12-17dft.oap.nkc.BJDdoc.doc" deleted by Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US]

Isabel DeLuca In case Nancy KC hasn't caught one of you yet,... 12/18/2009 10:34:01 AM

From: Isabel DeLuca/DC/USEPA/US
To: "Rona Birnbaum" <Birnbaum.Rona@epamail.epa.gov>, "Ben DeAngelo" <DeAngelo.Ben@epamail.epa.gov>
Cc: "Dina Kruger" <Kruger.Dina@epamail.epa.gov>
Date: 12/18/2009 10:34 AM
Subject: Fw: Issa response

In case Nancy KC hasn't caught one of you yet, here are her edits to the Issa letter. It needs review for accuracy of the science, and Jason's out, so I'm hoping someone is in and can take a look.

I thought it seemed ok. for the most part. In the part where it mentions ocean acidification, perhaps it should be listed as an example of climate change rather than warming? Also, in the line where it mentions that our conclusions are based on numerous datasets, maybe we should add "of various climate indicators," so they don't assume we're just talking about the temperature records?

Nancy Ketcham-Colwill

----- Original Message -----

From: Nancy Ketcham-Colwill
Sent: 12/17/2009 07:40 PM EST
To: Isabel DeLuca; Jason Samenow; embrey.patricia@epa.gov
Cc: Carol Holmes; Diann Frantz
Subject: Issa response

See what you think of this draft. I'm drawing from your draft response, the RTC and some other things I think I've heard. Please let me know where I strayed off the mark or otherwise got something wrong. I also ask a question or two in brackets. Any and all edits are welcome.

[attachment "Issa.12-2.12-17dft.oap.nkc.doc" deleted by Ben DeAngelo/DC/USEPA/US]

Marcus
Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US
07/23/2010 11:12 AM

To Jason Samenow
cc Lesley Jantarasami, Rona Birnbaum
bcc
Subject Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Yeah. Definitely unconventional - gets somewhat more speculative than we are elsewhere, but I also wouldn't like highlighting the "discourteous" nature of Jones' remarks without noting that there may have been somewhat extenuating circumstances (and it isn't like just because one is an academic, any random researcher anywhere in the world can expect you to drop everything and prepare data for them... it often happens, because science advances through information sharing and collaboration, but it isn't something that is a guarantee).

So, at least as far as I'm concerned, you walk the line properly,

-Marcus

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
fax: 202-343-2202
1310 L Street 256C
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
with the EPA Climate Division

Jason Samenow | I took a crack at this. Parts of the answer are a lit.. 07/22/2010 07:00:57 PM

From: Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 07:00 PM
Subject: Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

I took a crack at this. Parts of the answer are a little unconventional-- so feel free to make suggestions and/or tell me this is off base...

[attachment "Warwick Hughes comment + JPS.doc" deleted by Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US]

Lesley Jantarasami | Hi guys, Jason offered to take a first cut at crafti... 07/22/2010 01:44:17 PM

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 01:44 PM
Subject: Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Hi guys,

Jason offered to take a first cut at crafting a response if I wrote the comment summary (see attached). Marcus, maybe you can comment on the draft later this afternoon?

[attachment "Warwick Hughes comment.doc" deleted by Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US]

Thanks so much for your help - Dina's comments on Vol 3 are extensive, and we're trying to finish our edits by tomorrow...

Lesley

Marcus Sarofim

"Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- w...

07/22/2010 01:08:13 PM

From: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US
To: Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 01:08 PM
Subject: Re: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

"Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- we might want to say that irrespective of Jones' reluctance to provide Hughes with the data, he does direct Hughes to various places for obtaining the data, while noting some of the data is restricted by governments. Also maybe we can say the HadCRUT trends were reproducible and that the methods for the temperature record had all been published?"

I agree with Jason that some more context in this response would be good: Jones does point Warwick Hughes at the available GHCN data in his e-mail response. You can also cite volume 1: perhaps something like, Responses in Volume 1.3.3.1 demonstrate that temperature reconstructions from publically available data such as GHCN look very similar to temperature reconstructions from HadCRUT, that the methods used by HadCRUT have been well-described in the literature, and that "the recent Independent Climate Change E-mails Review managed to write computer code from scratch in a space of two days that produced results similar to the HadCRUT and other independent analyses, working with publically accessible data."

-Marcus

ps. It would be nice to see Warwick's original email: some people seem to claim that it was the raw data (as suggested by Jones' response mentioning IPR problems with national Met offices), but others seem to claim that it was the list of stations that CRU used (which would somewhat less defensible because IPR reasons would no longer hold, though it still would be a pain to deal with). But I can't find it anywhere.

Marcus C. Sarofim, PhD
phone: 202-343-9993
fax: 202-343-2202
1310 L Street 256C
AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow
with the EPA Climate Division

Jason Samenow

Lesley-- There's a long comment and response...

07/22/2010 12:28:05 PM

From: Jason Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
To: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeremy Martinich/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/22/2010 12:28 PM
Subject: vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Lesley--

There's a long comment and response on page 74-75 of Vol 3 which includes the following quote from

Phil Jones cited by Peabody:

“We have 25 years or so invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?”

Then we say:

"There is no evidence to support the claim that Mann and Jones were attempting to obstruct the scientific method or avoid an honest review of their work because they feared criticism."

I think the courts could interpret the Jones quote as evidence of Jones seeking to avoid an honest review of his work.

Furthermore, this quote is included in the context of discussions on paleoclimate data -- when it was actually referring the HadCRUT instrumental temperature record.

This is the evident from the full email (from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3502.htm> -- note I don't think this email is from the CRU emails- but rather from an email Hughes submitted as evidence in the House of Commons Inquiry):

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 12:12:22 +0000

From: Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>

To: "wshughes@iinet.net.au" <wshughes@iinet.net.au>

Subject: Re: WMO non respondo

Warwick,

Hans Teunisson will reply. He'll tell you which other people should reply. Hans is "Hans Teunissen" <HTeunissen@wmo.int> .

I should warn you that some data we have we are not supposed to pass on to others. We can pass on the gridded data - which we do. Even if WMO agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it. There is IPR to consider.

You can get similar data from GHCN at NCDC. Australia isn't restricted there. Several European countries are. Basically because, for example, France

doesn't want the French picking up data on France from Asheville. Meteo France wants to supply data to the French on France. Same story in most of the others.

Cheers

Phil

I think there needs to be a separate comment and response on this issue. The Muir Russell report uses the Jones quote on page 37 : <http://www.cce-review.org/pdf/FINAL%20REPORT.pdf> to support a recommendation for "a new approach to the integrity, accessibility, and stewardship of data in publicly-funded science, arguing that researchers should make all research data, methods, and other information underlying the results publicly accessible in a timely manner."

So I think we should not try to defend Jones too much here and state this his comments were regrettable while mentioning possible motivations for his defensiveness.

This excerpt from an online discussion on the issue from a couple journalists -- who were seemingly objective on the matter (from: <http://www.monbiot.com/archives/2010/04/08/debate-with-steve-easterbrook/>) might provide some insights/ideas:

(keep reading below this long excerpt, I have one additional closing thought)

George writes:

Hi Steve,

I haven't yet read the Mashey report, which I will do now. But don't the emails suggest that M&M might actually have been right to believe that the restrictive licences were, at least in part, a smokescreen?:

"If FOIA does ever get used by anyone, there is also IPR to consider as well. Data is covered by all the agreements we sign with people, so I will be hiding behind them."

[Here's what Jones told another requester:](#)

"Even if WMO agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it."

And shouldn't we be concerned that commercial considerations are getting in the way of the free flow of information? Is that not antithetical to the open society and the spirit of scientific inquiry? It's something I've campaigned against in other areas: particularly the patenting of genetic material.

I react against it for two reasons: first that it's an enclosure of a common (and in this case publicly-funded) resource, secondly that it's the kind of convenient excuse everyone in authority hides behind these days, when there's something they don't want to tell us. (Sorry, I can't tell you that – security you know, er, health and safety, er commercial confidentiality). Here in the UK the terms of the stealthy privatisation of almost the entire public sector (the Private Finance Initiative) were kept secret from the public on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. I campaigned against that excuse for years. Only by using the FOIA, and by harrassing the bastards mercilessly, did we finally open up that can of worms, by which time it was all too late. I hope this gives you more of an idea of why my gut response is different from yours.

Steve writes:

George,

Yes, the emails make it quite clear Jones doesn't want to hand over his data, and is prepared to use any excuse not to. At face value, it certainly looks like he's got something to hide. But what? His work on the temperature reconstructions is sound, as has been shown by other reconstructions. The allegations made by M&M about temperature biases in surface station selection were clearly shown to be wrong by several independent analyses, including work by Tamino:

<http://tamino.wordpress.com/2010/02/25/false-claims-proven-false/>

by Wood and Steig:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2009/12/are-the-cru-data-suspect-an-objective-assessment/>

and many others. There's nothing wrong with any of the data, nor any of the science from Jones' team at the CRU. So why does Jones act in the emails like someone who wants to hide evidence?

The only reasonable explanation is that he wants to withhold the data because he's quite simply fed up with the constant baseless attacks. Ben Santer had already warned him how much time and effort it takes having to correct misrepresentations of their work. Refusing to cooperate with time-wasters is completely rational. We can argue whether in the long run this was a good idea; we can argue over what strategy scientists might best adopt in this situation. But the fact is that Jones chose the path of withholding his data, motivated partly by anger and partly by the desire to protect his time.

Bear in mind of course, that releasing datasets requires a non-trivial amount of work (to define the meta-data, and document the processing that has occurred), and often will still be useless to anyone else anyway. Bob Grumbine explains why:

<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2009/11/data-set-reproducibility.html>
<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2010/03/what-should-be-reproducible.html>

The normal practice is for other labs to get hold of the raw data independently and do their own reconstructions. So when someone comes along demanding the data, because they want to find flaws in work that's already been thoroughly replicated elsewhere, and is known to be sound, well, they're just timewasters.

And yes, there is a bigger context here – this science is fundamentally important for public policymaking, and must withstand a much higher degree of scrutiny than normal. Phil Jones might be guilty of not grasping this bigger issue, but then I don't think many people have put much thought into how we do this. The climate modelers I've spoken to cannot defend their software practices, nor can they adequately demonstrate they are using best practices (comparable, say with the best in the commercial software world). However, when you look at what they do, it turns out to be phenomenally good. The problem isn't that the code isn't subjected to scrutiny; the problem is that it's subjected to so much scrutiny in so many ways by so many people that nobody can give a coherent account of all of these, nor how they add up (I've made it my research goal to produce such an account for software development practices of climate scientists – I hope others can do the same for the data handling practices).

Bottom line: There are two hypotheses for why Jones talks this way in the emails: (1) because he has something nefarious to hide or (2) because he's fed up with people wasting time and making unfounded allegations, and wants nothing to do with them. Hypothesis 1 depends on there being something wrong with his work, but the reconstructions show it's sound. So we have to go with hypothesis 2.

BTW I agree completely with your comments about commercial considerations getting in the way of the free flow of information in the science community. Unfortunately, this is a result of lack of funding, particularly of meteorological research. Many weather services around the globe (the Met Office included) gain part of their funding from selling commercial forecasting services, and there is tough competition for some of the bigger customers. The dataset that M&M are after is drawn from meteorological services in many different countries, and many of them place different restrictions on it to protect their interests (several countries, including Canada, have refused to release their portions). Most of this, Jones and the CRU have no control over; when they obtained the data from these many different sources they had to sign agreements to respect confidentiality. Part of Jones' frustration is the amount of effort it took to do this (hence his response that M&M go collect the data from these various sources themselves).

We'd all much prefer meteorological data to be free and open – it would make our lives much easier. But we're faced with constant pressure on universities and government research labs to prove their value by commercializing the outcomes of their research, and by selling services. A growing proportion of the research is no longer publically funded – it's funded by industrial research grants and by income earned on "intellectual property". We're going to have to untangle the mess that free market ideology has made of our public research institutions to fix this problem. The real irony is that the those on the rightwing who have been most active in pushing this commercialization of research labs are now the ones screaming most loudly about freeing the data.

George writes:

Thanks for this Steve. I think you make a good case for what Jones's motivation might have been (and I wish to God that he or the university had come forward at an early stage to explain it: the mishandling of this crisis is a whole other saga).

If true, it sounds like a tragedy straight out of a Hardy novel – Jude the Obscure or Tess of the Durbervilles perhaps – misplaced action, misunderstood intentions, letters under the doormat. I'm prepared to believe that Jones is a good man who, partly because of the constraints he was under, made a series of disastrous tactical errors. On this account he emerges as a tragic figure, in the classical sense.

But, as Hardy shows, ultimately it's the actions, not the intentions that count. This is what we end up being judged by, and why it is so important both to act strategically and to act as if the world is watching. These days it probably is. It remains possible to praise the intention and condemn the action. Though he might have been acting with good intentions I still believe that what Jones did was wrong – and offensive to democratic values.

The points you make about commercial agreements are good ones. I would love to see scientists use this crisis to campaign for proper public funding of climate science and an end to the jumblesale of public assets.

Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- we might want to say that irrespective of Jones reluctance to provide Hughes with the data, he does direct Hughes to various places for obtaining the data, while noting some of the data is restricted by governments. Also maybe we can say the HadCRUT trends were reproducible and that the methods for the temperature record had all been published? (Marcus-- I believe Hughes request to Jones was for the original data for the HadCRUT dataset-- according to Pat Michaels (<http://article.nationalreview.com/407512/the-dog-ate-global-warming/patrick-j-michaels>): "Warwick Hughes, an Australian scientist, wondered where that "+/—" [in the temperature trend] came from, so he politely wrote Phil Jones in early 2005, asking for the original data."

Thanks for your patience on this :)

Jason

Marcus Sarofim
<msarofim@MIT.EDU>

09/07/2010 09:15 AM

To Rona Birnbaum, Ben DeAngelo, Jason Samenow, Jeremy
Martinich, Lesley Jantarasami, Michael Kolian

cc

bcc

Subject UEA response to various reviews mentions EPA

From:

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/mac/comm/media/press/CRUstatements/independentreviews/UEAreviewresponse>

5.3 More recently the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published its "Notice of Denial of the Petitions to Reconsider the Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases". The EPA conducted a comprehensive review of a number of issues including the allegations which had arisen as a consequence of the publication of the emails and other material. The Denial of the Petitions and the accompanying volumes are a substantial body of evidence and careful analysis. The summary (Section A) of the Denial states *inter alia* "Petitioners ... rely on an assumption of inaccuracy in the science ... based on various statements and views expressed in some of the e-mail communications between scientists at the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia ... and several other scientists...EPA's careful examination of the e-mails ... shows that the petitioners' claims are exaggerated, are often contradicted by other evidence, and are not a material or reliable basis to question the validity and credibility of the body of science ... Inquiries from the UK House of Commons, Science and Technology Committee, the University of East Anglia, Oxburgh Panel, the Pennsylvania State University, and the University of East Anglia, Russell Panel, ... have examined the issues and many of the same allegations brought forward by the petitioners ... These inquiries are now complete. Their conclusions are in line with EPA's review and analysis of these same CRU e-mails. The inquiries have found no evidence of scientific misconduct or intentional data manipulation on the part of the climate researchers associated with the CRU e-mails ... These inquiries lend further credence to EPA's conclusion that petitioners' claims that the CRU e-mails show the underlying science cannot or should not be trusted are exaggerated and unsupported".

<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/petitions/decision.html#I-A>

-Marcus

Jason
Samenow/DC/USEPA/US
07/22/2010 12:28 PM

To Lesley Jantarasami
cc Marcus Sarofim, Rona Birnbaum, Jeremy Martinich
bcc
Subject vol 3 response -- kinda important on phil jones email to warwick hughes

Lesley--

There's a long comment and response on page 74-75 of Vol 3 which includes the following quote from Phil Jones cited by Peabody:

“We have 25 years or so invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?”

Then we say:

"There is no evidence to support the claim that Mann and Jones were attempting to obstruct the scientific method or avoid an honest review of their work because they feared criticism."

I think the courts could interpret the Jones quote as evidence of Jones seeking to avoid an honest review of his work.

Furthermore, this quote is included in the context of discussions on paleoclimate data -- when it was actually referring the HadCRUT instrumental temperature record.

This is the evident from the full email (from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3502.htm> -- note I don't think this email is from the CRU emails- but rather from an email Hughes submitted as evidence in the House of Commons Inquiry):

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 2005 12:12:22 +0000

From: Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>

To: "wshughes@iinet.net.au" <wshughes@iinet.net.au>

Subject: Re: WMO non respondo

Warwick,

Hans Teunisson will reply. He'll tell you which other people should

reply. Hans is "Hans Teunissen" <HTeunissen@wmo.int> .

I should warn you that some data we have we are not supposed to pass on to others. We can pass on the gridded data - which we do. Even if WMO

agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it. There is IPR to consider.

You can get similar data from GHCN at NCDC. Australia isn't restricted there. Several European countries are. Basically because, for example, France doesn't want the French picking up data on France from Asheville. Meteo France wants to supply data to the French on France. Same story in most of the others.

Cheers

Phil

I think there needs to be a separate comment and response on this issue. The Muir Russell report uses the Jones quote on page 37 : <http://www.cce-review.org/pdf/FINAL%20REPORT.pdf> to support a recommendation for "a new approach to the integrity, accessibility, and stewardship of data in publicly-funded science, arguing that researchers should make all research data, methods, and other information underlying the results publicly accessible in a timely manner."

So I think we should not try to defend Jones too much here and state this his comments were regrettable while mentioning possible motivations for his defensiveness.

This excerpt from an online discussion on the issue from a couple journalists -- who were seemingly objective on the matter (from: <http://www.monbiot.com/archives/2010/04/08/debate-with-steve-easterbrook/>) might provide some insights/ideas:

(keep reading below this long excerpt, I have one additional closing thought)

George writes:

Hi Steve,

I haven't yet read the Mashey report, which I will do now. But don't the emails suggest that M&M might actually have been right to believe that the restrictive licences were, at least in part, a smokescreen?:

"If FOIA does ever get used by anyone, there is also IPR to consider as well. Data is covered by all the agreements we sign with people, so I will be hiding behind them."

[Here's what Jones told another requester:](#)

“Even if WMO agrees, I will still not pass on the data. We have 25 or so years invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it.”

And shouldn't we be concerned that commercial considerations are getting in the way of the free flow of information? Is that not antithetical to the open society and the spirit of scientific inquiry? It's something I've campaigned against in other areas: particularly the patenting of genetic material.

I react against it for two reasons: first that it's an enclosure of a common (and in this case publicly-funded) resource, secondly that it's the kind of convenient excuse everyone in authority hides behind these days, when there's something they don't want to tell us. (Sorry, I can't tell you that – security you know, er, health and safety, er commercial confidentiality). Here in the UK the terms of the stealthy privatisation of almost the entire public sector (the Private Finance Initiative) were kept secret from the public on the grounds of commercial confidentiality. I campaigned against that excuse for years. Only by using the FOIA, and by harrassing the bastards mercilessly, did we finally open up that can of worms, by which time it was all too late. I hope this gives you more of an idea of why my gut response is different from yours.

Steve writes:

George,

Yes, the emails make it quite clear Jones doesn't want to hand over his data, and is prepared to use any excuse not to. At face value, it certainly looks like he's got something to hide. But what? His work on the temperature reconstructions is sound, as has been shown by other reconstructions. The allegations made by M&M about temperature biases in surface station selection were clearly shown to be wrong by several independent analyses, including work by Tamino:

<http://tamino.wordpress.com/2010/02/25/false-claims-proven-false/>

by Wood and Steig:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2009/12/are-the-cru-data-suspect-an-objective-assessment/>

and many others. There's nothing wrong with any of the data, nor any of the science from Jones' team at the CRU. So why does Jones act in the emails like someone who wants to hide evidence?

The only reasonable explanation is that he wants to withhold the data because he's quite simply fed up with the constant baseless attacks. Ben Santer had already warned him how much time and effort it takes having to correct misrepresentations of their work. Refusing to cooperate with

time-wasters is completely rational. We can argue whether in the long run this was a good idea; we can argue over what strategy scientists might best adopt in this situation. But the fact is that Jones chose the path of withholding his data, motivated partly by anger and partly by the desire to protect his time.

Bear in mind of course, that releasing datasets requires a non-trivial amount of work (to define the meta-data, and document the processing that has occurred), and often will still be useless to anyone else anyway. Bob Grumbine explains why:

<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2009/11/data-set-reproducibility.html>
<http://moregrumbinescience.blogspot.com/2010/03/what-should-be-reproducible.html>

The normal practice is for other labs to get hold of the raw data independently and do their own reconstructions. So when someone comes along demanding the data, because they want to find flaws in work that's already been thoroughly replicated elsewhere, and is known to be sound, well, they're just timewasters.

And yes, there is a bigger context here – this science is fundamentally important for public policymaking, and must withstand a much higher degree of scrutiny than normal. Phil Jones might be guilty of not grasping this bigger issue, but then I don't think many people have put much thought into how we do this. The climate modelers I've spoken to cannot defend their software practices, nor can they adequately demonstrate they are using best practices (comparable, say with the best in the commercial software world). However, when you look at what they do, it turns out to be phenomenally good. The problem isn't that the code isn't subjected to scrutiny; the problem is that it's subjected to so much scrutiny in so many ways by so many people that nobody can give a coherent account of all of these, nor how they add up (I've made it my research goal to produce such an account for software development practices of climate scientists – I hope others can do the same for the data handling practices).

Bottom line: There are two hypotheses for why Jones talks this way in the emails: (1) because he has something nefarious to hide or (2) because he's fed up with people wasting time and making unfounded allegations, and wants nothing to do with them. Hypothesis 1 depends on there being something wrong with his work, but the reconstructions show it's sound. So we have to go with hypothesis 2.

BTW I agree completely with your comments about commercial considerations getting in the way of the free flow of information in the science community. Unfortunately, this is a result of lack of funding, particularly of meteorological research. Many weather services around the globe (the Met Office included) gain part of their funding from selling commercial forecasting services, and there is tough competition for some of the bigger customers. The dataset that M&M are after is drawn from meteorological services in many different countries, and many of them place different restrictions on it to protect their interests (several countries, including Canada, have refused to release their portions). Most of this, Jones and the CRU have no control over; when they obtained the data from these many different sources they had to sign agreements to respect confidentiality. Part of Jones frustration is the amount of effort it took to do this (hence his response that M&M go collect the data from these various sources themselves).

We'd all much prefer meteorological data to be free and open – it would make our lives much easier. But we're faced with constant pressure on universities and government research labs to prove their value by commercializing the outcomes of their research, and by selling services. A growing proportion of the research is no longer publically funded – it's funded by industrial research grants and by income earned on "intellectual property". We're going to have to untangle the mess that free market ideology has made of our public research institutions to fix this problem. The real irony is that the those on the rightwing who have been most active in pushing this commercialization of research labs are now the ones screaming most loudly about freeing the data.

George writes:

Thanks for this Steve. I think you make a good case for what Jones's motivation might have been (and I wish to God that he or the university had come forward at an early stage to explain it: the mishandling of this crisis is a whole other saga).

If true, it sounds like a tragedy straight out of a Hardy novel – Jude the Obscure or Tess of the Durbervilles perhaps – misplaced action, misunderstood intentions, letters under the doormat. I'm prepared to believe that Jones is a good man who, partly because of the constraints he was under, made a series of disastrous tactical errors. On this account he emerges as a tragic figure, in the classical sense.

But, as Hardy shows, ultimately it's the actions, not the intentions that count. This is what we end up being judged by, and why it is so important both to act strategically and to act as if the world is watching. These days it probably is. It remains possible to praise the intention and condemn the action. Though he might have been acting with good intentions I still believe that what Jones did was wrong – and offensive to democratic values.

The points you make about commercial agreements are good ones. I would love to see scientists use this crisis to campaign for proper public funding of climate science and an end to the jumblesale of public assets.

Lastly (Marcus-- this is where you come in) -- we might want to say that irrespective of Jones' reluctance to provide Hughes with the data, he does direct Hughes to various places for obtaining the data, while noting some of the data is restricted by governments. Also maybe we can say the HadCRUT trends were reproducible and that the methods for the temperature record had all been published? (Marcus-- I believe Hughes request to Jones was for the original data for the HadCRUT dataset-- according to Pat Michaels (<http://article.nationalreview.com/407512/the-dog-ate-global-warming/patrick-j-michaels>): "Warwick Hughes, an Australian scientist, wondered where that "+/-" [in the temperature trend] came from, so he politely wrote Phil Jones in early 2005, asking for the original data."

Thanks for your patience on this :)

Jason

Rona
Birnbbaum/DC/USEPA/US
07/24/2010 09:55 AM

To "John Hannon"
cc
bcc
Subject Fw: Section 3.3 for John

Here you go John

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services
Jeremy Martinich

----- Original Message -----

From: Jeremy Martinich
Sent: 07/23/2010 06:34 PM EDT
To: Rona Birnbaum
Cc: Lesley Jantarasami; Jason Samenow
Subject: Section 3.3 for John

Hi Rona,

Lesley and I decided that John should focus his time on 3.3 for now, and not worrying about 3.1 or 3.2 (as he's already seen them, and Dina and Carol have reviewed them as well). When 3.4 is finished, we will send that along as well.

Jeremy

Jeremy Martinich
USEPA, Climate Change Division
202-343-9871



3.3 for John.doc

Dina Kruger
<dinakruger1@gmail.com>

07/24/2010 05:28 PM

To Rona Birnbaum, martinech.jeremy, Jason Samenow, Ben DeAngelo, John Hannon, Dina Kruger

cc

bcc

Subject Last part of Volume 3

1 attachment



Volume 3 Process Issues 7-19-10 + DINA.doc

Hi all,

Finally had time to complete the comments on section 3.4 of Volume 3. One issue to flag for editors: I think we need to avoid using the word "skeptic" to describe people or things. (i.e., Climate Audit is a skeptic blog). If it is in quotes - used by the petitioners or in the emails, it is fine. But it is not a word for us.

I'm now ready to do more, but unsure where to turn. I can look at the decision document. I don't want to look at Vol 1 if it doesn't reflect John's comments. And I don't have Volume 2 with the ERG formatting, numbering, etc. (So I'm reluctant to start working off the old version).

I can come into the office tomorrow if needed, or work from here. Let me know what's up and guidance on how my time is best spent is also appreciated. :-)

Dina

Lesley
Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
07/29/2010 08:15 AM

To John Hannon
cc Dina Kruger, Erin Birgfeld, Rona Birnbaum
bcc
Subject Re: Volume 3

Here you go, John--



Volume 3 Process Issues 7-28 at 7pm.DOC

John Hannon

Can someone send me Volume 3? I'd like to go...

07/29/2010 08:14:44 AM

From: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 08:14 AM
Subject: Re: Volume 3

Can someone send me Volume 3? I'd like to go over 3.1 and 3.2. Thanks.

John Hannon
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (MC 2344A)
Washington, D.C. 20460
Phone (202) 564-5563
Fax (202) 564-5603

Dina Kruger

I understand that no one is thinking about this pi...

07/29/2010 08:07:04 AM

From: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US
To: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 08:07 AM
Subject: Re: the top emails

I understand that no one is thinking about this piece in that way at this time, but I am thinking of how we can potentially use something like this as a communication piece, or leverage it in that direction. But I still haven't reviewed what Lesley sent, so stay tuned.

Dina Kruger
Director, Climate Change Division
USEPA

202-343-9039 (phone)
202-343-2290 (fax)

Rona Birnbaum

Just to follow up on the top emails piece request...

07/29/2010 07:08:28 AM

From: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
To: Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, John Hannon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/29/2010 07:08 AM
Subject: Re: the top emails

Just to follow up on the top emails piece requested by OPA, it is not something that anyone envisions releasing to the public. Rather, if people raise specific questions with regard to these specific emails, folks wanted to know that they could be referred to specific places in the RTP for the response.

Thanks, Rona

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

Dina Kruger

----- Original Message -----

From: Dina Kruger
Sent: 07/28/2010 11:23 PM EDT
To: Rona Birnbaum; John Hannon
Cc: Lesley Jantarasami
Subject: Re: the top emails

Thanks -

I'll take a look tomorrow and we should consider if this is something to frame as a comm piece. (Don't know if its suited to that now, but a way for the public to have the other side of the most notorious emails would be good.)

Have read 3.4 and hats off to John and Lesley. It is really strong. I'm now turning to the rest of the document. It will likely be a long night, but I think we're in a good place.

Dina

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

Rona Birnbaum

----- Original Message -----

From: Rona Birnbaum
Sent: 07/28/2010 09:48 PM EDT
To: John Hannon
Cc: Dina Kruger; Lesley Jantarasami
Subject: the top emails

John, Erin and the press office asked for something very similar to what you had asked for.....the top emails that appeared in the press and whether/where we respond. Lesley has done that attached below.

----- Forwarded by Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US on 07/28/2010 09:45 PM -----

From: Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US
To: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stacy Kika/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 09:36 PM
Subject: Re: Prepping for Press Questions tomorrow

Erin, here is the Top 13 list - the sound bite quotes are in bold. Please let me know if you need more specific notations about where to find our answers to these in the volumes.

[attachment "Top 13 List.doc" deleted by Dina Kruger/DC/USEPA/US]

Lesley

Erin Birgfeld

Lesley - could you provide me on one document,...

07/28/2010 07:03:29 PM

From: Erin Birgfeld/DC/USEPA/US
To: Marcus Sarofim/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Lesley Jantarasami/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Rona Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Stacy Kika/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 07/28/2010 07:03 PM
Subject: Prepping for Press Questions tomorrow

Lesley - could you provide me on one document, the text of the "top 13" horrible emails that are used in the petitions and on blogs etc...

Marcus - could you provide me with the names of the studies that were included in the IPCC report despite the fact that scientists in emails said they were not acceptable for inclusion in IPCC. Also, a quick Q and A on the issue around the 2 studies that were not relevant to the report. Also, can you provide the sections that these issues are discussed in the decision docs.

Thank you both.

-Erin

Erin Birgfeld
Director of Communications
Climate Change Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
phone: (202) 343-9079
fax: (202) 343-2202

Rona
Birnbaum/DC/USEPA/US
07/28/2010 04:51 PM

To John Hannon
cc Lesley Jantarasami, Jeremy Martinich, Jason Samenow
bcc
Subject Vol 2



Volume 2 EPA Use of IPCC 7-28-10.doc

you may not have a lot of comments here but would be good for you to have another look since Carol saw it a while back.

Dina Kruger
<dinakruger1@gmail.com>

07/18/2010 09:09 PM

To Rona Birnbaum, Jason Samenow, Ben DeAngelo, Dina Kruger, John Hannon

cc

bcc

Subject Volume 2

1 attachment



Volume 2 EPA Use of IPCC 7-18-10 DINA - track.doc

Hi all -

Here's my track change on it. I think it's in good shape. There are a few places where I think we could do some tightening of the argument, and a few places where the comments don't have enough pizzazz, but it overall, the bulk of what we need is definitely there.

Thanks!

Dina